

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

**CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

---

Doe et al,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Regents of the University of Minnesota  
et al,

Defendants.

**COURT MINUTES**  
BEFORE: Hildy Bowbeer  
U.S. Magistrate Judge

Case No.:	18-cv-1596 (DWF/HB)
Date:	June 3, 2022
Courthouse	St. Paul
Location:	Via ZoomGov
Time:	10:33 am – 11:37 am (1 hour 4 minutes)

---

**APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiffs Does 1–2, 5–6, 8–10: David J. S. Madgett  
For Plaintiffs Does 4, 7, 11: Lee A. Hutton, III  
For Defendants: Daniel J. Connolly; Carrie Ryan Gallia

**PROCEEDINGS:**

The parties updated the Court on developments in the matters discussed during the May 25, 2022, case management conference (*see* May 25, 2022 Minutes [ECF No. 82]) and reported good progress. Certain items that remain outstanding were discussed.

The Court reminded Plaintiffs’ counsel to file notices regarding the change in representation for John Doe 7 from Mr. Madgett to Mr. Hutton.

Mr. Madgett reported that he had been able to access the University email accounts of his clients who did not have active accounts and for whom the University had to provide access. He also reported that all of his clients had completed a diligent review of their email and that they had no further documents to produce in response to the University’s discovery requests.

Mr. Madgett has submitted verified interrogatory responses from all his clients. Mr. Hutton is reviewing the interrogatory responses with his new client, John Doe #7, and will provide verified interrogatory responses promptly. The University requested that all

supplementation of interrogatory responses be complete and updated verifications provided by the date of their depositions.

Mr. Hutton will provide the executed authorizations for medical records from John Doe #11.

Regarding the University's production of documents, Plaintiffs' counsel raised a possible concern regarding whether documents and communications pertaining to the Dorsey investigation report had been produced. The Court directed counsel to meet and confer on that subject.

The parties have confirmed deposition dates, formats, and locations for Hutton Plaintiffs ## 4 (in person), 7 (remote), and 11 (in person), and Madgett Plaintiff #1 (remote). Defendants have proposed dates to depose the remaining Madgett Plaintiffs and have indicated which of those they intend to take in person. Mr. Madgett will respond promptly regarding those dates and the proposed format.

Ms. Marisam will be deposed in person on June 29. Defendants have offered dates for Mr. Coyle in July, but at the request of Plaintiffs' counsel will inquire about Mr. Coyle's availability in June. Plaintiffs intend to subpoena Jane Doe and Jane Doe's counsel for deposition.

Plaintiffs' counsel raised the idea of extending the deadlines in the scheduling order for 60-90 days. Defendants' counsel stated that Defendants would oppose any such proposal. The Court directed them to meet and confer, but noted that any motion on that subject would have to be handled by the next magistrate judge.

s/ NEH  
Judicial Law Clerk